

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

By this paper, Applicant replies to the Office Action of December 24, 2009 and respectfully requests reconsideration of the application.

Applicant genuinely appreciates the careful consideration and clear writing in the Office Action of December 2009. Because of the care and completeness of the discussion in the Action, it was very easy to identify precise points of agreement and disagreement, and to resolve the disagreement. Applicant looks forward to working with Examiner Karmis on this basis.

The amendments clarify that the method claims are not in step-plus-function form.

Claim 1 is discussed vis-à-vis Woodmansey '410 at pages 3-4 and 5-6 of the Action. Claim 1 recites as follows:

1. A method for use in an electronic trading system, the method comprising the steps of:
  - receiving a bid at the electronic trading system;
  - receiving at the electronic trading system a designation of a linking parameter linking the bid to an offer, and generating an offer based at least in part on the bid and the designated linking parameter;
  - receiving a parameter from a user designating a relationship specifying the timing at which the bid and offer are to be brought to market, including specification of a time interval between the times that the bid and offer are to be brought to market relative to each other,** the timing relationship with its time interval between the bid and offer being enforced by the trading system.

In the interview of June 21, 2010, it was agreed that the designated portions of Woodmansey '410 do not disclose a “parameter” with the properties recited in the claim. Likewise, no language in Woodmansey '410 was identified that suggested combining the existing features of Woodmansey '410.

Claims 17, 34, 45 and 56 recite similar (though not identical) language, and are patentable for similar reasons. The dependent claims are patentable therewith, and add further limitations that further distinguish the art.

Applicant hereby authorizes the USPTO to communicate with any authorized representative concerning this application by electronic mail.

A Petition for Extension of Time extends the shortened statutory period through June 24, 2010. Accordingly, this reply is timely. In the event that further extension of time is required, Applicant petitions for that extension of time required to make this reply timely.

In view of these remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant requests that the application be passed to issue in due course. The Examiner is urged to telephone Applicant's undersigned counsel at the number noted below if it will advance the prosecution of this application, or with any suggestion to resolve any condition that would impede allowance. For the entire pendency of this application, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional required fees (including all extension of time fees), or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-3938, Order No. 00-1027.

Respectfully submitted,

ATTORNEY FOR ASSIGNEE

Dated: June 23, 2010

By: /David E. Boundy/  
Registration No. 36,461

BGC Partners, Inc.  
110 East 59th St.  
New York, NY 10022  
(212) 294-7848  
(917) 677-8511 (FAX)